Interpellation.	Answer.
(iii). Are the Government aware of the fact that the said licensees, in disposing of their salt at the factory to merchants for the same rate as that of the Government, have included the cost of transport as well? If so, do not the Government consider that the inclusion of the Government charge in the selling price of the licensees an unnecessary profit to them, an additional burden to the consumers, and a loss to the Government?	
(v). If the Government think that under the agreements with the licensees they cannot be prevailed upon to lower the prices, will it not be advisable for the Government to remove the transport charges included in their selling price of salt in the factories—the place of production—where actually they have not to incur any cost on account of transport?	
(v). Are the Government aware of the fact, that the uniformity in fixing the transport charge of six annas at the factories and the distant salt depots, is with a view to have the same rate in all the Government places of issue, irrespective of the distance and the expenditure? If so, do not the Government think that they are the legitimate claimants for that charge of six annas included in the selling price of the licensees? If, on the other hand, the Government think that they have no claim over it, is it not advisable to the Government to disallow the meaningless transport charge of six annas for the benefit of the consumers, and have only the duty and actual cost price of four annas as the selling price at the factories?	
(vi). Will the Government be pleased to take it from me that, by such undue profit, the licensees of the new factories are enabled to attract all the available coolies to their side by enhanced wages, and thus greatly handicap the licensees of the old factories, the pioneer salt manufacturers of the State, who are unable to compete with them on account of their low *kudivila*?	It is true that to some extent the new licensees have the advantage over the old licensees in the matter of securing labour for the factories, but the new licensees have had to sink very large capital in their factories, while the old licensees have had to make comparatively much smaller capital outlay. The new licensees maintain the factories at their own cost, while the old factories are maintained at Government cost. The Government have in recent years done a great deal to help the old licensees. The *kudivila* was raised from Chs. 7½ to Chs. 11¼ per maund in 1092, and just lately the rate was again raised by another half a chackram.
7. II. (i). Are the Government aware,	*Chief Secretary Mr. N. Rajaram Rao.*
(*a*) that till the middle of March 1920, all Travancore cattle were allowed free grazing in all the State Forests;	No; only such cattle as belonged to the subjects of the State were so allowed.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Interpellation.	Answer.
(*b*) that Notice No. 590/F. & M. R., dated Trivandrum, 5th March 1920, further amending the revised rules dated 23rd August 1911, issued under Sections 21 and 22 of the Forest Regulation, prescribing fees for the grazing of cattle, local and foreign, in the State Forests, was published in the Government Gazette dated 16th March 1920;	Yes.
(*c*) that immediately after the publication of the above Notice, the Forest Range Officers of the Aramboly and Kalkulam Ranges warned the inhabitants of several villages in the Thovala taluk by beat of tom-tom against allowing their cattle to enter the forests without obtaining passes on payment of grazing fees;	The Conservator of Forests is enquiring whether local cattle belonging to *bona fide* Travancore subjects are being subjected to the payment of the fees.
(*d*) that since the completion of the Kodayar Irrigation Scheme and the consequent extensive conversion of dry lands into wet lands and the selling away of several extensive tank beds, the grazing problem in Nanjinad has become more and more serious every day?	No.
(ii) Will the Government be pleased to state how many petitions and protests against the levy of grazing fees on Travancore cattle were received since the publication of the Notice mentioned in (*b*), Part (i), and how they were disposed of?	Four petitions were received, one from the Member himself. It was referred to the Conservator of Forests and on his reporting that the enhanced grazing fees applied only to foreign cattle, a reply was given to the Member in Government letter No. 2572/F. & M. R., dated the 5th July 1920. Two other petitions related to the same matter and so no action was taken in respect thereof. The fourth petition was from Mr. M. Chidambarathanu Pillai and some others of Nanjinad. This has been referred to the Conservator of Forests for report.
(iii) Will the Government in consideration of the present imperative necessity to encourage cultivation in all possible ways, the poor and emaciated condition of the Travancore cattle, and the present need for the greater supply of manure, abolish the grazing fees levied on the Travancore cattle, especially agricultural live stock, and adopt the former free pass system?	No fees are levied in respect of cattle owned by *bona fide* subjects of Travancore.
(iv) Are the Government aware of their order No. 2240/F. & M. R., dated 17th June 1920, pointing out that the Travancore cattle are still having free grazing in the State Forests, and the Chief Secretary's letter No. 2572/F. & M. R., dated 5th July, 1920, sent in reply to my letter to the Government, of 28th March last, expressing surprise at my protest against the levy of grazing fees on agricultural live stock? If by the above two documents the Government mean that they have given the ryots no cause for complaint, will they be pleased	The Government are aware of their orders referred to by the Member. In regard to the conduct of the Range Officers in question, the Conservator of Forests is making enquiries.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Interpellation.	Answer.
to explain the action by the two Range Officers as mentioned above?	
8. III. (i) Will the Government be pleased to place on the table a statement of tank-beds, that have been disposed of either by auction sale, registry or otherwise, on account of their being rendered unnecessary through the completion of the Kodayar Irrigation Scheme, showing,	Government are of opinion that no useful purpose will be served by the collection of the vast amount of statistics required to answer the interpellation in full. Tank-beds to the extent of 1,300 acres and 73 cents were sold in auction and 90 acres and 41 cents were registered since the completion of the Kodayar Project.
(*a*) the taluk, pakuthy, survey number, area and the name of each tank-bed or portions of each tank-bed so disposed of;	
(*b*) the total area each tank was originally irrigating;	
(*c*) whether sold in auction, registered in the names of individuals, or made use of for Government or other purposes;	
(*d*) the amount realised for each, and the amount that has yet to be realised through the concession granted to the subjects of His Highness the Maha Raja of paying the amount in 5 yearly instalments;	
(*e*) the total yearly assessment of tax and water cess for each; and	
(*f*) the permanent remissions, if any, made in the assessment of tax subsequent to the date of disposal of such tank-beds?	
(ii) Will the Government be pleased to give a list of tank-beds that are yet under proposal to be disposed of on the ground of their having become unnecessary through the completion of the Kodayar Irrigation Scheme, showing the taluk, pakuthy, survey number, area and the name of each?	Government do not propose to call for the information.
Mr. K. A. Krishna Aiyangar.	*Secretary Mr. K. Narayanan Pandalay.*
9. I. (*a*) Will Government be pleased to state what was the length of the Alleppey-Shertallai Canal as originally sanctioned by Government?	The length of the canal as originally sanctioned is about 13 miles and 2,960 ft.
(*b*) What length has been completed at each end?	One mile at each end of the canal.
(*c*) What was the estimated cost of the work?	Rs. 5,11,670.
(*d*) How much has been already spent on the work?	Rs. 2,83,807-1-14.
(*e*) Do Government propose to complete the canal as originally settled?	The Government have issued orders to the Chief Engineer to suspend further investigation in connection with the canal, and to submit an estimate for the investigation of a light railway in place of the canal.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly